UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,471	11/06/2003	Hirohito Inoue	2003-1507A	8583

513 7590 03/01/2006

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER	
VELEZ, ROBERTO	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2829	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,471	INOUE, HIROHITO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roberto Velez	2829	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/06/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Okabe (US Pat. 6,459,285)*** in view of ***Tokisue et al. (US Pat. 5,258,047)***.

Regarding claim 1, ***Okabe*** shows (Fig. 1) a burn-in apparatus for screening plurality of semiconductor devices comprising: a plurality of training operation wafers [16] each formed of a semiconductor to which a conductive film is applied on a face thereof, or a material having conductive properties [21]; a cassette [11] having a plurality of slots [13] for housing the plurality of training operation wafers [16], and a plurality of electrodes [55] for contacting the plurality of training operation wafers when the plurality of training operation wafers [16] are inserted into the plurality of slots [13]; a vacuum pincette [53]; voltage application means [14, 15] for applying a voltage between each electrode [55] of the cassette [11]; and state detection means [14] for detecting contact between

the pincette [53] and each wafer [16] by detecting a potential of each electrode [55] of the cassette [11] or a current flowing to the electrode [55].

Okabe fails to disclose wherein the vacuum pincette has a conductive suction part for operating on the plurality of training operation wafers; and wherein a voltage is applied between the conductive suction part of the vacuum pincette. However, ***Tokisue et al.*** shows (Figures 1-4) a vacuum pincette [2, 2A, 2a, 4, 3, 9, 5, 6, 10, 8, 7] having a conductive suction part [3, 4] for operating on the plurality of training operation wafers; and wherein (Column 4, Line 68 and Column 5, Lines 1-10) a voltage [6] is applied between the conductive suction part [3, 4] of the vacuum pincette [2, 2A, 2a, 4, 3, 9, 5, 6, 10, 8, 7].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of ***Tokisue et al.*** into the device of ***Okabe*** by including a vacuum pincette having a conductive suction part and applying a voltage to it. In the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of (Column 4, Line 68 and Column 5, Lines 1-10) applying a voltage between each electrode of the cassette and the conductive suction part of the vacuum pincette. Since the wafer has a conductive film applied to its face thereof, the potential of the conductive film on the wafer becomes equal to the potential of the conductive portion [4], that is, equal to the ground potential. Therefore, a potential difference develops between the wafer's conductive film and the electrode [3], so that an attractive force F, equal to an attractive force (suction) is exerted between the wafer's conductive film and the electrode [3].

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Okabe (US Pat. 6,459,285)*** and ***Tokisue et al. (US Pat. 5,258,047)*** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ***Zohni et al. (US Pat. 6,540,467)***.

Regarding claim 2, combination of ***Okabe*** and ***Tokisue et al.*** disclose everything claimed above in claim 1, with the exception of a cassette having display means for specifying a training operation wafer to be operated on based on operation specification information. However, ***Zohni et al.*** discloses (Column 9, Lines 15-29), LED lights [1046] as display means for specifying the situation concerning the functions being done in the cassette.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of ***Zohni et al.*** into the device of the combination of ***Okabe*** and ***Tokisue et al.*** by including a cassette having display means for specifying a training operation wafer to be operated based on operation specification information. In the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of indicating if the functionality of the cassette is good or bad concerning the wafer that the operator wants to test.

Regarding claim 3, combination of ***Okabe*** and ***Zohni et al.*** disclose everything claimed above in claims 1 and 2; in addition, ***Okabe*** discloses (Column 7, Lines 33-42) decision means [14] for deciding whether an erroneous operation occurs based on a result of detection by the state detection means and the operation specification information.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Okabe (US Pat. 6,459,285)*** and ***Tokisue et al. (US Pat. 5,258,047)*** and ***Zohni et al. (US Pat. 6,540,467)*** as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of ***Tanaka et al. (US Pat. 5,777,485)***.

Combination of ***Okabe*** and ***Tokisue et al.*** and ***Zohni et al.*** fail to disclose a decision means having output means for generating sound when the decision means decides the erroneous operation has occurred. However, ***Tanaka et al.*** discloses decision means [4] having output means for generating sound (Column 12, Lines 33-37) when the decision means [4] decides the erroneous operation has occurred.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of ***Tanaka et al.*** into the device of the combination of ***Okabe*** and ***Tokisue et al.*** and ***Zohni et al.*** by including decision means having output means for generating sound when it decides the presence of erroneous operation. In the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of generating a warning sound to notify an operator of a possible defect in the system.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rochet et al. (5,929,766) discloses a device for controlling semiconductor wafer transport cassettes. ***Rochet et al.*** discloses (Column 3, Lines 54-62) a

cassette having lamps [32] as display means for specifying a wafer to be operated based on operation specification information.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Velez whose telephone number is 571-272-8597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberto Velez
Patent Examiner

PARESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

02/24/06